



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0505MO-1 for Maryville R-11 School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant highlights the existing collaborative, how the districts support each other's strengths and weaknesses and how they share resources, while still maintaining autonomy, which implies a comprehensive relationship and ability to work collaboratively to achieve a vision.</p> <p>Practices and programs that address the four core educational assurance areas are mentioned, but lack some integration into a coherent description and vision for NWMRC's future.</p> <p>Applicant discusses "common methods and models" for low-performing schools, but does not include detail, specific practices, or a vision for improving future low-performing schools. The applicant briefly states that practices have included aligning instruction with student academic interests, which is important, but is not a silver bullet to turning around low-performing schools.</p> <p>The vision is based more on the extensive historical success of the collaborative working together, rather than a future vision, but it does demonstrate a clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement through the formation of strong partnerships and shared resources.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) All 21 districts and all 47 schools, part of a 10-year consortium, will participate. This decision was based on a history of collaboration and numerous meetings with various stakeholder groups.</p> <p>While not required as part of the grant application, the application would be further strengthened by a description of an analysis process to evaluate the readiness of all participating schools and districts.</p> <p>(b) All schools and LEA's are listed, as required.</p> <p>(c) The total number of low-income students is cited, but lacks detail on other subgroups. While the "N" size might be too small in the individual schools/LEAs, it would still be useful to include overall subgroup data for the consortium as a whole.</p> <p>Applicant includes a strong description and organizational chart of overall structure for implementation, which indicates a well-thought out structure and implementation process.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While numerous programs are cited, the applicant does not discuss how the programs will scale up or how they will translate into meaningful reforms across the districts (i.e. communication structures, implementation strategies). This said, since all schools are part of the initiative from the start, scaling up to additional schools might not be relevant. But, how change occurs in the schools and districts is relevant and is not clearly stated.</p> <p>The logic model includes various items and reform practices and discusses an overall theory of change which is sufficient, but it lacks timelines, deliverables, persons responsible, and overall goals, i.e. the components of a high-quality plan. Some of the desired outcomes, activities, and responsible parties are strong and included in the narrative for subsection A4.</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Minor weaknesses in specific performance measures are noted below, but overall the applicant proposes ambitious and achievable goals, which align to the overall desired outcome of the grant program.</p> <p>(a) The table shows that some schools are expecting a drop in scores at the end of the current school year. For example, Fairfax has a baseline (SY '11-'12) of 55.6% and is predicting a SY '12-'13 score of 44.2%. There is no discussion of why such schools expect a decrease over the current year. In effect, in some cases, it will take several years to reach the current baseline again, which does not demonstrate sufficient growth.</p> <p>The student performance measure goals for some schools are incremental, but still ambitious and reasonable. Yet, other currently higher-performing schools do not have ambitious goals. The overall goal of all schools achieving 70% proficiency (in Communication/MAP) is not ambitious, as it does not differentiate for each school's baseline.</p> <p>The goals for English 2 (EOC)/MAP have similar issues. While some of the post-grant goals are differentiated, many of the 84% post-grant goals are lower than the goals for '15-'16 SY. There is no explanation for why the scores would decrease.</p> <p>(b) The goals for decreasing the achievement gaps for low-income students seem reasonable and ambitious.</p> <p>(c) The goals for increasing the graduation rate are differentiated based on the baseline data and seem reasonable. Some goals look overly ambitious, but may be feasible due to the small student populations.</p> <p>(d) While 86% is a reasonable goal, especially with small student populations, the same issue with differentiation occurs with college enrollment rates.</p>		

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The data provided shows student learning outcomes in both 2008 and 2011. The application states that the consortium had higher proficiency rates than the state in those two years, yet it is unclear how the consortium performed in 2009 and 2010. Growth in the low-income subgroup is demonstrated in Math. The gap for Communication Arts decreased, but only slightly between 2008 and 2011. Improvements in other learning outcomes are also provided, but lack historical context. The lack of more historical data and the only incremental improvements do not demonstrate an ability to make significant improvements in closing achievement gaps.</p> <p>(b) An example of improvements at one low-performing school is included. The applicant states that reforms have been enacted, but does not provide any detail on what those reforms are, nor does it provide an overall strategy to address the lowest-achieving schools. The applicant does not include any information to demonstrate its ability to significantly improve low-performing schools.</p> <p>(c) Performance data is disseminated and is used to inform and improve instruction for each student.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant sufficiently addresses all four of the transparency categories, but it is unclear if support staff and other non-personnel expenditures are also included in the stated documents/reports.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium has a strong history of providing supportive conditions, funds, supports, and programs for the various districts (based on their individual needs), which reflects an ability to differentiate supports based on needs.</p> <p>Each superintendent has the appropriate authorities to make decisions for his/her own schools or district. Such autonomies</p>		

are also highlighted in the consortium's governing agreement.

The consortium also has a lengthy history of utilizing state supports and resources to align practices/curriculum/etc across the participating districts, such as the Show-Me Standards.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a) The application includes a description of how the proposal was developed and revised by multiple stakeholder groups. While some parent associations submitted support letters, it is unclear if meaningful stakeholder engagement occurred with parents and the broader community. The applicant cites strong involvement by students, and notes areas where the proposal was modified due to student feedback.

All LEAs include the signature of their teacher association representatives, with the exception of Worth County R-III and King City-I. It is unclear why those two LEAs do not have the requisite signatures. The application cites that 96.2% of teachers are supportive of the proposal, while not required by the application, it would be useful to have the information broken down by school and/or district.

(b) As required, the application includes a significant number of letters of support from various organizations and political leaders across the region.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The application includes detailed information on three different audits that will be led by an external organization, with input and support from local staff. The audits include technology, curriculum, and instructional strategies. Due to the small and rural nature of this consortium, those three areas address many of the needs and gaps that will be addressed to provide personalized learning environments.

The applicant is aware of the regions' needs, and acknowledges the imperative need to work together in collaboration to best reach all student and to pool resources to address each other's gaps.

While most of the components of a high-quality plan are included, a timeline for the audits is not provided. It is unclear how the consortium will move from audit results to plan development, and eventually to implementation.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) (b) The applicant has an extremely strong plan to share resources across the consortium via a variety of technology-based systems and practices. This requires collaboration and alignment across schools and districts. It ensures that students have access to a broad range of classes and teachers, outside of their somewhat limited individual buildings. These practices also allow teachers and instructional staff to share resources from a common resource bank as well. Even with this collaboration, the consortium recognizes its continued limitations and will explore external online programs for students with specific needs and interests, to further personalize learning offerings.

Students whose needs have not been traditionally met will take part in a separate well-established ACES program to address academic and behavioral needs. Additional supports for students with disabilities/special education students are not explicitly stated.

There is a strong plan for engaging parents in student learning, while also building the knowledge and capacity of parents.

All students are required to develop a career/education plan and are provided a variety of programs to explore various careers, earn dual credits, and acquire job-based skills.

Teachers will learn about personalized learning environments, by experiencing them. Teachers will participate in the course and instructional audits, which will build self-reflection and capacity within the system, while also improving the educational experiences and curricular alignment for students.

The application lacks information on how student data is used to determine progress and how each student's personalized learning plan is actually developed, modified, and assessed.

The various components of a high-quality plan are embedded through the intermediate outcomes and various pieces of the application. The timeline and process for implementing the learning strategies are presented and seem adequate, but could be more explicit and detailed.

(c) It is unclear how students would be aware of what courses and programs are available to them. It is also unclear what supports students and teachers would receive on the ground at their own buildings to ensure they understand how to use the tools and resources available to them, especially in relation to online learning.

While an important piece of implementation, the overall Learning score remains strong due to the comprehensive nature of the supports, programs, and resources that will be provided to support personalized learning.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) (b) Teachers will participate in the audits to develop their own capacity while creating the plans for the consortium. Highly capable teachers will be targeted for leadership opportunities. Developing teacher capacity to instruct students' personalized learning environments is central to the consortium's proposal. Each district will have a differentiated plan to address its own strengths and needs. Sharing existing resources and skills across the consortium is central to building long-term capacity and is noted throughout their plan.

The applicant envisions an organizational structure of train-the-trainer to bring strategies to scale throughout the districts and region.

The applicant cites the importance of assessment and evaluation, but does not elaborate on how appropriate systems will be assessed and implemented.

There is a strong plan for creating PLCs, across the consortium, to address the isolation of rural and small schools. The face-to-face meetings are crucial to the PLCs, but the application lacks information on how teachers will utilize the PLCs between the face-to-face and online meetings.

There is little discussion on how specific teachers would be selected to lead ITV courses, i.e. to ensure that the best teachers being utilized to teach the courses to students outside of their buildings.

(c) The application includes a strong and well-thought out plan to implement the educator evaluation system, currently being piloted throughout the state. Both the educator and principal evaluation systems recognize the importance of collecting various types of data, as well as using the evaluations to inform continuous learning needs and individualized professional development, and monitoring progress.

The applicant proposes to use a variety of state standardized tests, in addition to a variety of performance measures that will be used across the districts. Training on how to gather and assess student data, for teachers and administrators, is included in the plan.

It is unclear how the applicant will use the results of the educator and principal evaluations to determine collective professional development needs and structural changes.

(d) The applicant acknowledges the need to recruit capable teachers and will use a variety of structures, including a "placement day" and student teaching to improve recruitment and increase retention.

The applicant has a high percentage of students receiving instruction from high quality teachers, but does not include information or the components of a high quality plan on how they propose to increase that percentage, or how the consortium will directly address recruiting teachers for hard-to-staff schools and/or subjects, both of which are required.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a) An existing agreement ensures the participating districts are able to share, collaborate, and pool resources for needed

services. An existing Governing Committee will oversee the overall plan. The Committee will jointly recruit and select a grant administrator, who will be supported by the lead LEA staff and infrastructure. All member LEAs have their own school leadership teams to determine their own conditions and policies.

(b) All superintendents of the participating districts are supportive and have the autonomy to make necessary condition changes.

(c) "Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic" is stated as a goal for the E3 collaborative, but the plan for implementation is vague. Examples of how career tech education students are able to prove mastery through various types of assessments are provided.

(d) While implied in various pieces of the personalized learning environment description, "giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways" is not addressed for all students.

(e) While implied in various pieces of the personalized learning environment description, "providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners" is not addressed.

An extremely strong organizational structure is planned and described, but subsection e is not addressed.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) (b) The applicant proposes a variety of programs, tools, resources, structures, and strategies, but ensuring that all stakeholders (students, parents, educators, etc) have access to and supports for the use of those resources is not directly addressed. The technology audit will examine such infrastructure issues, but the applicant does not propose any specific practices or plans to address access or supports to stakeholders (both in and out of school).

(c) The applicant proposes parents and students will have access to information, but it is unclear if they will be able to export that data in ways that can be used with other electronic learning systems.

(d) The LEAs have the ability to select their own data systems, but it is unclear what information is included in each of those systems and if the systems can "talk" to each other to integrate and compare data across the consortium.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There is a strong description of the external evaluation to assess the effectiveness of the consortium's proposal, including all intermediate outcomes, and how the model is designed to allow for continuous improvements and adjustments based on needs of individual schools and/or LEAs. Stakeholder input is included in the monitoring and evaluation process. The applicant does not provide sufficient detail on how the quality of investments will be determined.

A dissemination plan is also included and is sufficient to reach a variety of stakeholders.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

With the exception of the dissemination of the program evaluations, there is little information on the ongoing communication and engagement strategies of internal and external stakeholders. It is assumed that communication will be continued amongst the internal and external stakeholders, but there is no explicit plan to use the results of the various assessments to continuously improve implementation.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A strong variety of academic, climate, and instructional performance measures are provided and are reasonable, but the rationale for selecting those measures is not provided.

Some of the goals for student achievement have differentiation issues and raising the floor and raising the ceiling, as stated in previous sections.

The application does not include information on E(3) subsections b or c.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The external evaluation includes plans to evaluate the effectiveness of RTT-D funded activities through formative, implementation & process, and progress evaluation strategies. The evaluation plan is strong and will adequately address the success of the initiative.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant does not identify any other sources of funding outside of RTT-D, including any other federal or state programs that may already exist in some of the schools/LEAs and are likely to align to this initiative (i.e. title I, TIF, school improvement, etc).

(b) The budget reflects changing needs throughout the grant period, which indicates a well-thought out plan for implementation, and will initially focus on the purchase of and upgrading technology.

(c) As required, the budget includes the rationale for each expenditure and personnel position in each of the four main project areas.

While the applicant states that recurring expenses are built into the individual district's annual budgets, it is unclear what expenses those are, how much they cost, and the duration of those expenses.

Despite being a strong overall budget, the score is reduced slightly since additional sources of funds are not provided and a clear description of one-time vs ongoing expenses is not provided.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes to use the funds to build capacity and reform systems, both of which will likely create sustainability after the grant program terminates.

The applicant includes plans to purchase new technology (after the grant period ends) over time to ensure that technology is continually updated, without adding a substantial cost burden to participating districts.

Information regarding the phase out process or incorporation of other expenses into the annual budgets of the consortium districts (post-grant period) is not included for any of the projects. Therefore, the sustainability of these programs beyond the grant program is unclear. While capacity will be built in the system, costs will still exist. In effect, pieces of a sustainability plan exist, but the components of a high-quality plan are not explicitly provided.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The ACES program is well-established and has a history of success with the participating districts. ACES also fully aligns to the personalized learning community goals of this grant.

The program has partnerships with a variety of other community-based programs to address needs of at-risk students (including social workers, other state agencies, and support services).

Sufficient professional development for ACES staff is cited, but the applicant does not address how learnings from ACES will be incorporated/scaled up into the broader educator community.

The applicant does not address how the collected data would be used to target resources to improve results. For example, the application could be further strengthened if the applicant further described how data analysis could be used to "catch" students before they reach the point of needing ACES supports.

Performance goals are provided, but there is no context for those goals, i.e. what is the baseline that ACES students currently have?

The performance measures indicate the goal to increase the number of students receiving services through ACES, which may indicate an increase in capacity, but it also implies that the knowledge of ACES is not transferring to the local schools sites.

Despite being a strong program, the applicant does not provide a description of how it will scale the model beyond the targeted ACES students, how it will integrate ACES learnings and practices into the rest of the school community, how it will assess the needs of the community, or how it will assess the effectiveness of the ACES program over time.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

While the applicant omits or is vague on various requirements of the grant application, as a whole, the consortium has a strong plan to provide personalized learning environments for all students (and teachers). The consortium will use a variety of programs, supports and technologies to reach students in small rural schools to ensure that each student has an individualized learning and career plan. As defined, the applicant proposes an innovative plan to connect students to additional learning opportunities, to achieve economies of scale, and to effectively use existing strengths and resources. The use of technology will distribute high quality instruction across the region and will provide students with additional subject areas and levels of mastery. The applicant proposes a strong plan that could be a model for the rest of the country.

Total	210	167
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0505MO-2 for Maryville R-11 School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's vision narrative cites examples of piloted or locally implemented strategies across consortium districts which have been successful for this collaborative model. As a result the vision is able to accommodate the strengths and

weaknesses while also having the autonomy to match resources and strategies to the needs of the students.

The consortium of 21 districts thinks of itself as a large single campus, rather than self-contained units working in isolation. As a result of this collaboration, the districts are able to maintain their identities and autonomy while leveraging their dollars and expertise in order to maximize resources and increase student achievement.

Although documented data was not provided to support the success of the district's vision demonstrates its forwarding thinking by building on best practices and consolidating and aligning resources that can be effectively used to address the consortium's common concerns.

- all members have adopted prior and current standards
- developing high quality personalized learning experiences for students based on the standards
- common methods for turning around lowest achieving schools
- programs and models that have increased student equity

Overall, the extent to which the applicant has set forth a comprehensive reform vision is satisfied.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
---	----	----

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's reform proposal process was based on the need to remove barriers of isolation that exist within rural educational settings, and in order to decrease the existing gaps for rural educators and students with special needs the districts recognized the need for collaboration and to use this proposal as an opportunity to close the gaps building upon the previous successes. The strengths of this proposal:

- The 47 schools across 21 districts have been identified in this application are part of a consortium comprised of rural school districts which have identified schools that meet the eligibility criteria;
- All participating LEA's identify as rural
- 977 educators will participate
- 2,603 students have been identified as low-income and high-needs
- Total of 6,305 students will participate
- Organizational chart highlights implementation plan structure

Overall, the applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of this proposal.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's reform proposal for LEA-wide reform and change is presented well planned and logical. The applicant employs a model that demonstrates a plan that gradually moves from individual consortium district pilots to full consortium implementation. The applicant's plan model includes building upon:

- Proven track record of collaboration over a period of ten years
- Consortium schools have initiated multiple networks for the purpose of addressing common issues and share effective practices
- logic model addresses the needs of rural schools
- Inclusion of resources that have been identified as successful
- Identified seven learning outcomes that yield the same results for all students
- Creating common schedules in order to allow for meaningful and relevant collaboration
- Scaling up across all district schools but no specific details are provided

The applicant's plan for reform and change is strong and presents a realistic model that will support district-wide reform and change in order to effectively focus on student achievement and close achievement gaps

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's vision for LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes and goals demonstrate a concerted effort to increase achievement. The outcomes stated are both ambitious and achievable and align to the overall desired outcomes of the grant proposal.

- The identified populations play a significant role in evaluating the effectiveness of plans that are designed to improve student performance based on equity and access
- Outcome are ambitious but achievable, the applicant appears to have taken a realistic approach when establishing the goals in the context of the existing student needs and gaps:
 - goals for decreasing achievement gaps for low-income appear to be reasonable and ambitious
 - goals for increasing the graduation rate are based on baseline data and appear to be ambitious
 - goals for college enrollment are reasonable and ambitious but achievable based on small population rates
- The tables show an anticipated decrease in scores for some years but no documentation or rationale has been presented to support this anticipated decrease

Overall, the goals are reasonable and achievable and likely to result in improved student learning.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant's proposal has provided strong examples of demonstrated success. The data provided shows student learning outcomes in both 2008 and 2011, and states their proficiency rates were higher than the states those two years. There is strong evidence of consistent success embedded throughout this narrative. (a) In demonstrating a clear track record of success the applicant provides data to support the consortium's average outperforms the state average. The data provided by the applicant clearly demonstrates increased achievement in both math and communications arts for students eligible for free and reduced pay lunches. (b) The example provided identifies the gains in a low-performing school rising from 25.5% to 41.3% in math, and from 35.8% to 49.2% in Communication Arts, and has a strong basis for continued gains. The applicant does not provide additional details to demonstrate what strategies were used to achieve this success as well as how it will scale this up to all low-performing schools in this consortium. (c) Performance data is regularly made available to students, parents and teachers and used to inform and improve student instruction and services Overall, the applicant has demonstrated its ability to improve student learning based on the past four years, however more complete groups of serviced students should be provided.		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant addresses all four of the transparency categories. The narrative documents details regarding the extent and level of transparency. The applicant acknowledges this high level of transparency has occurred as a result of the state and district's embracing an increased use of technology, which have afforded the public greater access to information regarding expenditures from State and local funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • student performance • demographics • salaries for personnel and non-personnel • Current daily expenditures • budget and tax rate hearings • Sunshine laws Overall, the applicant has demonstrated evidence of a high-level of public transparency in its LEA processes, practices and investments.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		

The applicant has a a prior record of reform efforts that have been effective and consistent as a result of the funds, supports and programs instituted at various districts. This level of support has resulted in positive reforms that have had a positive impact on student achievement

- All parties have demonstrated key support by adopting and implementing key strategies (e.g. Show Me Standards, Common Core standards, teacher evaluation, ACES)
- Consistently demonstrated successful reform efforts and positive gains in student achievement
- Actively sought and managed resources received from outside funding sources to support student achievement
- Each LEA has autonomy to make appropriate decisions for their district and/or schools
- recipient of Missouri's ESEA flexibility waiver gives them ability to disaggregate data in order to identify and focus on specific achievement gaps
- Initiatives are needs-based and and consistently focus on reform practices and individualized student learning

Overall, the applicant has demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and required autonomy in order to implement personalized learning environments.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The criteria requires letters of support from the specified stakeholders, and the applicant has submitted nearly seventy letters of support from multiple key stakeholders:

- LEAs,
- students,
- individual teachers,
- CTA, local community-based and civic organizations,
- tribes,
- institutions of higher education,
- advocacy groups

The application could have been strengthened if the applicant had provided additional letters of support from the school PTO's. Because there are over 47 schools involved in this plan, it is critical that parents and their feedback are engaged in this process. The applicant includes a description in the narrative that discusses how the key stakeholders were involved in the development and revision stages of this proposal it is unclear what level of engagement experienced by parents and PTO's.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's process for analysis in order to determine its needs and gaps is to conduct three audits: technology, curriculum, instructional strategies, in order to determine the best plan to implement personalized learning environments.

Due to the geographical and instructional challenges of this rural consortium, those three audit areas address many of the needs and gaps that will address student achievement and increased equity . This is a really strong approach taken by the applicant to successfully identify and analyze its needs and gaps, however, the proposal could have been strengthened if the applicant had provided a timeline detailing how these audits will be conducted.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a presented a plan that demonstrates evidence for improving learning and teaching by personalized learning environments in order to provide all students the support to graduate college-and-career ready is ambitious and achievable.

- Inclusive plan addresses multiple levels of needs for all learners (e.g... rural, special needs, accommodations)
- All students are required to develop a career education plan and are provided multiple opportunities to student achievement (dual enrollment, career technical education, alternative credit option)
- Innovative use of technology to increase access and equity for students in areas that lack either the curriculum that may not be available in their own district (e.g... shared learning, 1-to-1 technology, distance learning programs, videoconferencing,)
- Teachers will learn about personalized learning environments by experiencing them
- Students will be offered access to courses through ITV , which are courses taught by teachers
- Research and evidence based instructional best practices to address all learners and learning styles
 - the one exception is listed in 3(b) Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures description does not mention how this approach to student engagement differs from traditional instruction, and how are the program's results are assessed and/or measured.

The applicant has placed considerable emphasis on the use of technology in order to create an effective model of personalized learning environment for students and teachers. The cornerstone and foundation for this model will be ensuring access to technology, and to make it available to all students in a reasonable timeframe. While the applicant has provided a detailed and comprehensive technology plan to ensure all students have that access and equity, The plan does not include how all opportunities will be made available for those areas that lack may be technologically challenged. It would have been helpful if the applicant could have provided alternative methods for how personalized learning environments will be available to students in the absence of technology.

Overall, the applicant has presented a plan of good quality that solidly prepares and supports students and their families for personalized learning environments with multiple opportunities for achievement, access and equity tailored to their academic and environmental challenges.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The extent to which the applicant has high quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the supports to graduate college-and-career ready, has demonstrated that at best the applicant has addressed a majority of the criteria selection, with the exception of criteria (C)(2)(d).

- Teachers will participate in audits to develop their own capacity while creating plans for the consortium
- Highly capable teachers will be targeted for leadership opportunities
- Each district will have a differentiated plan to address its needs but share resources across the district in order to build capacity
- Train the trainer model
- PLC's to remove barriers of isolation faced by small rural schools using face-time and online meetings

It would have strengthened the plan if the applicant would have provided specific details on how this plan would allow effective and highly effective teachers and principals to have a broader impact on students who are faced with some of the challenges listed, such as hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and especially students who have been identified as special education.

Overall, the applicant has presented a plan of high quality for teaching and learning, but it could have been strengthened if a details had been provided to describe how this plan will increase students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The extent to which the applicant has a high quality plan to support project implementation is acceptable, based on the reasonableness agreements as follows:

- All LEAs agree to abide by a Governing Committee comprised of consortium leadership, and its policies, rules and practices that facilitate personalized learning.
- Each LEA will maintain autonomy as it pertains to the determining and establishing the needs of their

district/educators/students and will be held responsible for carrying out the functions of the e3 collaborative model in order to promote a broad movement toward personalized learning environments.

- Students are given multiple options and opportunities to demonstrate topic mastery based on mastery rather than time-on-task
- Applicant selected differentiated instructional strategies utilized by the consortium over the past ten years that have proven to be successful

Overall, applicant has a high quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies that provide every student with an appropriate level of support.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

5

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a detailed strategy outlining the purpose and context for the personalized learning environments in order to decrease achievement gaps and increase student achievement, by creating equity and access to the necessary tools and resources.

The applicant acknowledges the current gaps as a result of geographical and socio-economic challenges that maybe encountered by students who live in areas identified as rural.

The applicant's plan does clearly demonstrate a logical and methodical approach to LEA and school infrastructure, however, it would have been helpful to the reviewer if the applicant had addressed how this infrastructure would be able to support students and families who may be face obstacles when trying to access the necessary content, tools or other learning resources for personalized learning environments. By doing so, the applicant would have been able to determine the full scope of technical support the students and their families will need in order to successfully achieve the goals to be implemented in this proposal.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant's continuous improvement process plan strategy is to create an ongoing system of checks and balances to insure fidelity to implementation of the grant as well as on-going reporting on the progress of goals and outcomes. The applicant's plan employs the services of outside evaluators who will collaborate with applicant to develop and implement the plan for continuous improvement. The methods employed to monitor this project meet expectations needed to insure a continuous improvement process. The applicant has given careful consideration to the high degree of required monitoring needed due to the complex nature of this collaborative plan. Therefore It is critical to be able to provide a plan to insure a high quality implementation. This is justified and demonstrated by the strategic details outlined in this plan which give considerable thought to the use of formative and summative evaluations, the time in which they will given at various stages of implementation, and evaluates all components as they work in collaboration. This method allows any identified barriers to immediately be addressed cooperatively, rather than in isolation, which is essential to the success of personalized learning environment. This plan consistently demonstrates and affirms consideration, not just to the needs of the students, but the implications as a result of personalized learning environments, as they involve using qualitative and qualitative data to assess and inform the effectiveness of the collaborative model.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant plan for a rigorous plan of continuous improvement is convincing in its approach to insure that the plan is achievable and measurable results will be used to productively use time, staff, money and other resources to meet goals and milestones at various stages of the project.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The extent to which the applicant's high quality plan with strategies for ongoing communication and engagements with internal</p>		

and external stakeholder, the applicant has identified several strategies to effectively and closely monitor and evaluate the plan's implementation, assess progress and inform improvements to internal stakeholders, however, it would have been helpful if the applicant had provided specific details on how it would make information available to external stakeholders who do not have access to computers, therefore limiting their ability to access evaluator's communications.

Overall, the applicant's has met a majority of the criteria for this selection by demonstrating a strong effort for continuous improvement.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's evidence to support the criteria for the selected performance measures is incomplete but lacked the rationale on how they would accomplish these measures.</p> <p>The selection of criteria is consistent with the challenges in tracking enrollment.</p> <p>K-3 safe schools violations discipline referrals per student demonstrates where some schools numbers are double-digit and triple digit numbers. The methodology used to establish targets is insufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan builds on past progress and success in language arts Consistent upward progression in subgroup in closing achievement gaps The number and percentages of participating students is Insufficient but not inadequate <p>Overall, the applicant's proposed performance measures and annual targets for ambitious but achievable targets. All performance indicators are moving in an upward direction for improvement but fails to provide the rationale and methodology behind the projections.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's plan effectiveness to evaluate RTTD funded activities is provides for high level of accountability for progress as early as implementation and throughout the life of the grant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant has identified three strategies to be effectively meet this criteria as well as provided a detailed narrative that supports the plan's effectiveness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant's plan to use Formative, Implementation and Process, and Progress evaluation strategies support the applicant's plan and vision to insure fidelity, on-going internal assessments to determine effectiveness of activities and strategies, and remediate barriers that may exist. <p>Overall, the applicant presents a plan that is well thought out and assumes an approach that takes full responsibility to use time, staff, money and other resources effectively in order to improve results that will accomplish the effectiveness of sustaining personalized learning environments.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The importance for creating a sound infrastructure is paramount to the success of this project. The applicant's budget narrative and tables demonstrates a prudent and judicious plan for development and implementation of proposal. The budget outlines the four areas for which this project will support. All areas are essential to the projects existence. The budget aligns to the applicants proposal to provide equity and access for all students, teachers, and districts who are using the e3 collaborative model.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bulk of the funding will be used to support technological devices or one-time investment, to provide technological devices for personalized learning Budgetary consideration has been given to the need to provide direct support for students for students whose needs surpass those of their counterparts (additional services, technological careers and hands on learning) 		

- Professional development model that build capacity by supporting a model that utilizes teacher trainers,
- Budget considers sustainability

Overall, the applicant's budget for the project is justified and consistently demonstrates a thoughtful rationale in projecting funds needed for applicant's implementation of personalized learning environments. It would have strengthened the proposal if the applicant had identified other funfunding sources such as state, local and other Federal funds that could be used to support this project.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Overall, the applicant's plan for sustainability demonstrates and is evidence of the planing and thought process and willingness to take on a project of this magnitude presents a high quality plan.

It is significant in that the plan is clear, succinct, and demonstrates ambitious but realistic measures that allow for the participant to maintain and sustain the infrastructure and supported timeline ensures the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

- strong professional development builds capacity over the long-run
- staggering technology to be integrated into annual budget
- Recurring expenses will be built into the annual budgets
-
- The plan calls for replacing the devices incrementally. The cost for replacing these devices will be handled on cost-effectively as a consortium wide basis, rather on an individual basis. The applicant has demonstrated how the ongoing operational costs to support the personalized learning environments can be shifted and planned for as reoccurring expenses.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has provided a description that is coherent and sustainable. The partnership has been in effect for several years and its model of support of high-needs students has yielded success. The services provided highlight the current challenges from the demands of broad geographical challenges from large rural areas. Overall, the applicant's narrative meets the criteria for this preference. The desired results for students, given the challenges are ambitious yet achievable because the performance measures for the proposed population have been previously supported and proven successful.

- The partnership goal provides opportunities for students to receive the necessary supports while being given opportunities to rehabilitate negative behaviors
- Whole child reform involves partnerships that support the educational, social, and behavioral development
- Parental involvement increases due to broader access to websites using technology
- Students are provided additional services enabling them to be successful and college and career ready high school graduates
- Increase the role of ACES comprehensive program of services that address the emotional, social, behavioral, and academic needs of students in grades K-12 in
- Serve students in both prevention and intervention programs
- Improved students outcomes for students who were previously identified as "at-risk" (e.g... dropouts, alternative schools, behavioral issues, and transition to back to traditional schools)

Overall, the applicant has provided the documentation to support a competitive preference priority.

Absolute Priority 1

--	--	--

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's application has met the criteria of coherently and comprehensively to address the core educational assurance areas to create personalized learning environments to improve learning and teaching through the use of e3 collaboration model and adoption of standards that are aligned to college-and-career ready standards, and develop a plan that presents as ambitious yet achievable plan. The applicant has consistently demonstrated and provided the support for an ambitious yet achievable plan to implement and sustain personalized learning environments for students who have been marginalized as a result of the obstacles that result from from large rural areas by proposing the adoption of one-to-one technology by providing computer devices such as iPads or laptops for all students in this consortium; to support various methods that will bridge learning gaps such as distance learning, videoconferencing, elearning; narrow the digital divides by providing access to technology beyond the school and put it into the community; provide students with learning opportunities that remove isolation and academic limitations such as greater access to career and technical education, dual enrollment; and encourage professional collaboration outside of the school that builds capacity, affords more opportunities for teacher collaboration and ongoing professional development (eMints, teacher trainers).</p>		

Total	210	184
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0505MO-3 for Maryville R-11 School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant presents a reform vision that is doable and ambitious; however, Applicant needs to include additional data to support vision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant Northwest Missouri Rural Consortium (NWMRC) offers details of a high-quality, comprehensive, coherent reform vision that builds on its work in core educational assurance areas. Through its continued implementation of current programs and revisions based on student data, NWMRC articulates a clear reform vision that will lead to successful actions to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through personalized student support. Its past collaborative successes give strength to its vision and success. Applicant articulates a clear, credible approach using programs which have increased student equity across NWMRC. Programs include Area Cooperative for Educational Support (ACES), Parents as Teachers (PAT), and enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS). Programs offer "personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. These programs are tools for Applicant to reach the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equality through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. Applicant mentions four core areas; however, data is needed to support reform efforts centered on core areas. 		

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant's approach to implementation provides convincing details that Applicant will support and lead all consortium districts and schools. LEA will provide high-quality consortium and school-level implementation based on its prior ten-year history of collaboration and success.</p> <p>(a) Applicant offers multi-faceted descriptions of consortium- its school systems, collaborative design, student and teacher demographics, and ten-year history of NWMRC. Participating schools collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements. All 21 consortium districts are participants.</p> <p>(b) A list of the 47 participating schools is included.</p> <p>(c) Total number of students is 6305 with 2703 young people from low-income families who are considered high-needs students.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant offers incomplete information that relates to how its plan will improve student learning outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since all schools are included in plan, the reform is district-wide with no plan necessary for "scaling up" and translation into system-wide change. • Even though all schools within the 21 rural school districts are included in E3, this section does not adequately address how the applicant will reach its outcome goals. • Although plan includes graphics of the E3 Logic Model and the State and National Shared Resources Consortium Level Sustainability, there are few details specific to how the plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who are served by the Applicant. 		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides data that provides complete data in a, b, c, and d. The narrative and graphic representations of data are reader-friendly for all parties who may request information. The majority of Applicant's data support goals that are both achievable and ambitious; however, some project goals are lower than current performance creating discrepancy in goals in some performance areas.</p> <p>(a) Applicant includes summative assessments being used including the Missouri Assessment Program testing (MAP) Communication Arts scores which indicate proficiency status and growth. In 2010-2011, overall baseline proficiency for consortium schools is 46.79 with 2014-2015 goal of 61.5%. Summative assessments support goals that are both ambitious and achievable.</p> <p>(b) Applicant includes a detailed graph of decreasing achievement gaps in consortium from 2010 with stated goals from 2013 through 2017. Data reveals significant gaps between free lunch and non-free lunch students. In communication arts the gap was 20 % in 2010-2011. Applicant's goal is to reduce the gap to 7.97% in 2013-2014 which is reasonable and ambitious.</p> <p>(c) Applicant includes graduation rates for all schools (students who receive free lunches and who don't receive free lunch) with goals of 100% graduation rate in 2015-2016 which is reasonable and ambitious.</p> <p>(d) Applicant includes college enrollment rates from 2010 with stated goals from 2013 through 2017. 2010-2011 rates range from 52% to 74% with no separate data for students receiving free lunch. College enrollment goals for 2015-2016 range from 84% - 86% which is reasonable and ambitious.</p> <p>(e) The majority of Applicant's data support goals that are both achievable and ambitious; however, some project goals are lower than current performance creating discrepancy in goals in some performance areas.</p>		

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

--	--	--

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Application includes strong, extensive descriptions, charts, raw student data, and other evidence that demonstrate the applicant's ability to advance student learning and achievement. Applicant has record of success in the past four years as indicated by consortium statistics, results of reform, continued efforts for educational excellence, and access to data; however, more complete descriptions of groups of serviced students should be provided.</p> <p>(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From 2008 to 2011, consortium student learning outcomes improved in Math and Communication Arts with increasing percentages of students scoring proficient or above on Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) tests. Additionally, a higher average percent of consortium students, across participating districts and grade levels, scored proficient or above (in both 2008 and 2011) when compared to the state as a whole.. Improved student learning outcomes are also seen in the consortium through graduation rates and college enrollment . Median graduation rates increased for the consortium, as a whole, from 92.02% in SY 2010-11 to 92.67% in SY 2011-2012. Large variances in graduation data are found with multiple districts achieving 100% 4-year graduation rates (overall and free/reduced lunch eligible students) and several districts showing significant ranges in data due to small enrollment numbers. This implies incomplete data or insufficient support. College enrollment rates increased in the consortium as a whole from a median of 64.84% in AY 2010-2011 to 67.87% in AY 2011-2012 for a median increase of 5.43 percentage points. No data are available to examine graduation rates of students who qualify for free and reduced lunches. <p>(b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consortium districts have made ambitious and significant changes in low-performing schools based on achievement gaps in student MAP performance in Communication Arts and Math; however, the Applicant does not provide its strategy to improve low-performing schools. <p>(c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consortium makes student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in varied ways including district websites, state Department of Education website, paper notifications, summative and formative data, parent grade book portals, school-related organizations, and scheduled meetings. 		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Application successfully describes availability of information in each of the categories. The Missouri Department of Education website contains all information listed in a, b, c, and d. Applicant displays evidence of a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Applicant's ten-year history and existing regulations for its members provide strong evidence that it has successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments described in proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA demonstrates evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. Evidence explains consortium's governing cooperative agreement for sufficient autonomy. For example, each school district must sign an agreement of cooperation and make available its physical facilities to other consortium members. 		

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant includes evidence of stakeholder engagement; however, the lack of sample size and responses for the teacher survey weaken its reliability and validity. Also, Applicant lacks adequate parental responses.</p> <p>(a)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence indicates extensive, meaningful stakeholder engagement from proposal development, letters of support, parent and student feedback, and community-wide public forums to elicit discussion and ideas. Note that E3 teachers do not have collective bargaining; however, 96.2% of survey respondents supported the core assurances of Race to the Top Grant proposal. Application does not include size of above referenced survey sample. Survey results are weak due to this lack of specificity. <p>(b)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application includes letters of support from all areas of consortium communities including schools, neighborhood watch groups, PTAs, and American Legion. Applicant needed to include additional letters from parents and parent organizations. 		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant includes components of a high-quality plan; however, it lacks a timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEA successfully demonstrates some elements of a high-quality plan that will analyze applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments. This is evidenced by the independent audits completed for all consortium member schools. The eMINTS National Center will conduct three audits (technology, instructional, and curriculum practices) of each district. Audits will further identify needs and gaps to be addressed by plan. Proposal addresses needs of students who qualify for free and reduced price lunches in large, rural area.. Applicant's plan lacked a timeline which is an element of a high-quality plan. 		

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has a strong plan to implement and increase personalized learning environments throughout the consortium schools. The interdependency of its schools to achieve educational choices and excellence is a strength that increases student choices, decreases achievement gaps, and deeper learning. Applicant needs to more completely address other student populations and issues including ethnic minorities and students with disabilities. Applicant lacked sufficient information about mechanisms to provide training and support to students to understand tools and resources to track and manage learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant has elements of a comprehensive, high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. Applicant has current programs that include parents, educators, students, and administrators in making choices that personalize learning, help students accomplish goals, provide regular feedback, determine progress, and experience personal and academic growth. Applicant has a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments including online courses and shared classrooms/teachers across consortium. Applicant notes training mechanisms for students, teachers, and parents; however, additional details are needed about the allocation and provision of the mechanisms. Applicant's plan to expand eMINTS will provide instructional audits to determine best whole school reform or 		

transformation using technology and inquiry-based teaching in all consortium classrooms with increased, improved personalized learning for all students.

- Applicants provide students direction in both career and post-secondary planning through assessments, counseling, parent education, academic plans, academic feedback, and other opportunities.
- Applicant's plan contains limited references to special education/cross-cultural/ethnic minority student populations within consortium.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

18

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's comprehensive plan has strong components related to teaching and leading. Applicant displays a minor weakness with a lack of complete information about students in specialty areas. Following are strong examples within Applicant's plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready:

- To improve instruction and increase capacity to support accelerated student progress for all students toward meeting college- and career-ready standards via personalized learning environments and student directed teaching." An example is the training that will be provided for all educators through the Northwest Missouri State University Regional Professional Development Center.
- Access to the Missouri Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) and the Missouri Student information System (MOIS) will provide access to data to link with professional development and student achievement.
- Provide districts (through e-MINTS-led instructional audit) "an objective view of instructional practices to inform decisions about professional development needed to reach desired types and levels of instructional practice to achieve proposed goals. Professional development interventions will be adapted to meet district and teacher needs and will provide additional modeling for participants of adapting personalized learning for students."
- Increase number of students who receive instructions from effective and highly effective teachers and principals with online ,video, team teaching across schools, expansion of currently successful programs, and increased use of data to make instructional decisions to close achievement gaps and improve student performance through consortium.
- Adopt the Missouri model system of evaluation (teacher and principal) design. Example is Missouri's Educator Evaluation System.
- Offer rigorous, logical plans and programs to "improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready.." An example is the wide selection and variety of online instructional programs available to students.
- Applicant lacks sufficient plan for students in specialty areas such as special education or areas other than low-income students. This is a minor weakness in application.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

LEA has an achievable, comprehensive plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with needed support and resources; however, a minor weakness is the failure to address student connectivity access.

a. Collaboration, ongoing communication, and the sharing of best practices have undergirded the work of NWMRC for the past ten years and are key to the implementation of this proposal. The 21 LEAs making up the NWMRC have long standing practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning. In 2005, the NWMRC formally established, pursuant to authority granted by Sections 70.210 - 70.320 of the Revised Statutes of Missouri, 1994, a governing cooperative agreement as the Area Cooperative for Educational Support. The agreement has been extended and amended over the years and establishes the practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning through this proposal.

- b. The consortium governing structure provides for the individual NWMRC districts maintain their own identities, autonomy, and capacity for self-direction, yet leverage their dollars and expertise by working cooperatively to provide necessary and expanded services and extended learning and teaching options, fostering the personalized learning environment necessary to not only meet the needs of their students and staffs, but to accelerate and deepen students' learning. Consequently, all Member Districts of the NWMRC have established school leadership teams in their participating schools with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets.
- c. The approved educational services of the E3 collaborative model gives students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. An example is a selection of an online program which offers additional choices for personalized learning.
- d. The Applicant's plan provides students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways while providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students. An example are varied virtual learning platforms which provide multiple opportunities to revise assignments, retake assessments, and review material during evaluations.
- e. Although the Applicant states that all learning resources and instructional practices "are adaptable and fully accessible to all students," the Applicant fails to offer an explanation about provision of Internet access to students.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's LEA and school infrastructure likely supports personalized learning; however, Applicant fails to provide complete information.

(a) All students and teachers will be provided personal learning devices to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal. Parental access is not addressed.

(b) Applicant does not address technical support in this section.

(c) Applicant does not address the exporting of information in an open data format.

(d) Applicant does not specifically address the use of interoperable data systems in this item; however, MOSIS and MCDS are interoperable data systems as previously mentioned in proposal.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant has a quality approach to continually improve its plan; however, a weakness is that the plan does not completely address public sharing about the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top- District.

1. Outside evaluator who will offer initial and continuous evaluation of E3 progress toward project goals. The evaluative objectivity and vision strengthens this application.

2. Consortium schedules program reviews using its collaborative structure to identify best E3 practices. This model has been successfully used in prior consortium projects.

3. Applicant's inclusion of extensive projected outcomes and outcome indicators strengthens application providing benchmarks to allow the applicant to monitor and measure progress.

4. Applicant does not completely address how applicant will publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top; however, Applicant does provide for extensive program reviews.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has a strong plan with strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. In order to continuously receive feedback and improve its plan, Applicant will provide frequent program evaluations, individual school updates, website information of current program progress, outside evaluator feedback, and consortium-wide assessment in various forms. A minor weakness is the need for additional specifics about connecting with stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Although Applicant includes required performance measures, it fails to provide complete information.</p> <p>(a) Applicant fails to provide its rationale for selecting specific performance measures.</p> <p>(b) Applicant fails to explain how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information tailored to its proposed plan.</p> <p>Applicant fails to provide its theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern.</p> <p>(c) Applicant fails to provide how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant offers strong strategies and activities that result in evaluating the effectiveness of its investments.</p> <p>Elements of the Applicant's high-quality plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • both school wide and individual-initiated professional development with mechanisms for feedback • strategies to deploy and employ technology • organizational structure and administrative plan to improve results through expanded instructional-support positions for technology direction and assistance • utilization of an outside evaluator to conduct independent assessment of the E3 model • use of a progress evaluation to gather information to determine the impact of activities and strategies on current student/teacher/staff/community populations. 		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Applicant's budget includes all of the required components. The inclusion of program expenditures expressed as percentages and subsequent explanations is a strength; however, Applicant does not provide information about one-time expenditures/ongoing operational costs in either the budget or narrative. Applicant needs additional specificity.</p> <p>(a) Although Applicant's budget narrative includes no outside funding sources, Applicant includes external funding in its budget.</p> <p>(b) Budget is reasonable, reader-friendly, and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. For example, a strength of this budget is that it addresses its four budget areas with clear descriptions, comparison and contrasts to other budget items, and item's relation to whole budget implementation.</p>		

(c) Budget does not identify funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period, as described in the proposed budget and budget narrative, with a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments. This is a weakness of the Applicant's budget. The Applicant does address operating and recurring expenses in its narrative.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has elements of a high-quality plan; however, plan lacks information about replacement costs that would strengthen its sustainability plan.

1. Implementation timeline provides valuable information related to the implementation and sustainability of the project. For example, the timeline indicates that professional development related to personalized learning will continuously occur during the grant years. Since the Train-the-Trainer model will be used, future professional development may be provided by consortium members. This is an example of sustainability after the grant.
2. Applicant response does not include information related to financial support from sources other than grant; however, it does infer that replacement costs of personal learning devices will be staggered after initial investment with possible contributions by outside sources.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

ACES is the program explained for competitive preference. Although program accomplishments, purpose, and structure are completely explained, Applicant fails to completely explain the connection of program to overall budget and personalized learning

- ACES (Area Cooperative for Educational Support) is an integral component of the E3 collaborative model, providing a comprehensive program of services for students whose behavioral difficulties and academic issues have kept them from succeeding in traditional school. Programs through ACES serve students in grades kindergarten through twelve in both prevention and intervention programs. For the 2009-10 school year, ACES was awarded a federal grant to address the mental health needs of the students in the 21 districts and at the alternative school.
- The greatest benefit(s) of ACES program have been seen in the improvement of student outcomes for students placed at the alternative school. A strength of this facet is its comprehensive listing of ten population-level desired results for students in the consortium of LEAs that align with the E3 proposal.
- Partnership among districts: A strength of this partnership is the interdependency of individual districts for shared funds, educators, and resources as well as outreach to parents and communities. Partnership has experienced past successes and continues to set goals for additional successes for all consortium students.
- A strength of this program is its integration of education, career counseling, parental education, and social work services.
- A weakness of this component is the lack of information about immigrant/ethnic minority/ refugee population(s) within the consortiums' school districts.
- The partnership among consortium schools is integral to the ACES identification process and subsequent provision of services
- Parents are informed of all decisions concerning their child's enrollment in ACES. An example of parent and community involvement strategies are parent/teacher conferences with ACES staff and/or home district staff as often as needed.
- Outreach to parents is a strength of ACES due to its family education component, alignment of community resources to support student and family, and focus on total child.

The Applicant has a strong program for at-risk students with ACES. Its consortium-wide application executes consistency of service, intervention, academic and behavioral standards, and assessments for the NWMRC students. This is a strength for this program submitted for Competitive Preference Priority. A weakness of the proposal and program is its failure to discuss minority, special education, or non-citizen populations within the consortium's school districts. Additionally, the lack of a time table for successes and future program changes adds uncertainty to the narrative. Last, although program accomplishments,

purpose, and structure are completely explained, Applicant fails to completely explain the connection of program to overall budget and personalized learning.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Applicant meets Absolute Priority 1. First, the proposal comprehensively explains how the schools in the twenty-one districts - NWMRC) will impact system reform while leveraging current State of Missouri reform initiatives that address personalized student learning, college- and career- ready graduation requirements, and performance-based educator evaluation. The acquisition of personal learning devices partnered with opportunities in online learning, shared teachers across districts, and other instructional delivery methods offer students support, academic choices, accelerated student achievement, deeper student learning and vested ownership of personalized learning. Second, the Applicant explains the counseling and guidance actions required of each student to complete a career plan. Next, the proposal will expand student access to the most effective educators by expanding current programs like instructional video delivery and online classes through implementation of E3 program. Last, Applicant will leverage student choices and goals with consortium resources to increase graduation rates as well as college and career readiness. Applicant has made a strong proposal which could be replicated throughout the country. The Applicant also has a strong consortium that offers quality, expanded learning opportunities for all students.

Total	210	172
-------	-----	-----